

## **REMARKS**

**[0002]** Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-18, 20-38 and 40-55 are currently pending
- Claims 1, 26, 33, 37, 45 and 51 is/are amended herein

**[0003]** Support for the amendments to claims 1, 26, 33, 37, 45 and 51 is found in the specification at least at paragraphs [0040] and [0051]. Specifically, the independent claims have been amended to clarify that the TV tag comprises a “selectable hyperlink” as was disclosed at least at paragraph [0040] when discussing a viewer selecting a hyperlinked celebrity name. Additionally, the independent claims have been further amended to clarify that the selectable TV tag is either embedded in the web-based content at creation of the web-based content (see claims 1, 33, 37, 45 and 51) or that the TV tag is implemented to modify the web-based content after the creation of the web-based content. Support for this can be found at least at paragraph [0051] of the printed application (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0268403).

## **Cited Documents**

**[0004]** The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Schein: Schein et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,075,575
- Nsonwu: Nsonwu et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,678,473

- Ellis: Ellis et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2009/0019485
- Wang: Wang, U.S. Patent No. 6,675,385
- Tannenbaum: Tannenbaum, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0218599
- Jackson: Jackson, U.S. Patent No. 7,199,842
- Knudson: Knudson et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0204388
- Salvo: Salvo et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,341,271
- Dimitrova: Dimitrova et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0144293

**Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9, 11-18, 20-23, 25-30, 32, 33, 37, 38, 40, 44 and 51-55 Are**

**Non-Obvious Over Schein in view of Nsonwu**

**[0005]** Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9, 11-18, 20-23, 25-30, 32, 33, 37, 38, 40, 44 and 51-55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Schein in view of Nsonwu. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Independent Claim 1**

**[0006]** Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that independent claim 1 as amended is obvious in view of the combination of Schein and Nsonwu. Applicant submits that the combination of Schein and Nsonwu does not teach or suggest the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

1. (Currently Amended) A method comprising:  
receiving data that describes a television broadcast schedule;

rendering web-based content that is related to television entertainment, **wherein a TV tag is embedded in the web-based content as the web-based content is created;**

rendering, simultaneous with the web-based content, [[a]] the TV tag, wherein **the TV tag comprises:**

**a selectable hyperlink;**

an associated data element that is associated with at least a portion of the data that describes a television broadcast schedule, wherein a portion of the data that describes the television broadcast schedule that is contextually relevant in relation to the web-based content is displayed via the TV tag simultaneously with the web-based content; and

a plurality of associated actions; and

receiving an indication of a viewer selection of the TV tag, wherein the selection of the TV tag launches a display of an input area whereby users can indicate selection of at least one of the plurality of associated actions.

**[0007]** Claim 1 recites in part, “a TV tag is embedded in the web-based content as the web-based content is created.” The Office cites both Schein and Nsonwu, as teaching a TV tag. (Office Action, pages 5 and 6.) Neither Schein nor Nsonwu teaches that the “TV tag is embedded in the web-based content as the web-based content is created” as is presently claimed by independent claim 1. Additionally, neither Schein nor Nsonwu teach or suggest wherein the TV tag comprises a selectable hyperlink.

**[0008]** Consequently, the combination of Schein and Nsonwu does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2-18 and 20-25

[0009] Claims 2-18 and 20-25 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 2-18 and 20-25 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claim 26

[0010] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that independent claim 26 as amended is obvious in view of the combination of Schein and Nsonwu. Applicant submits that the combination of Schein and Nsonwu does not teach or suggest the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

26. (Currently Amended) A method comprising:  
rendering web-based content that is related to television entertainment, **wherein a TV tag is implemented to modify the web-based content after the creation of the web-based content;**  
rendering, along with the content, the selectable TV tag, wherein the TV tag comprises:  
**a selectable hyperlink;**  
a plurality of associated actions; and  
an associated data element;  
receiving an indication of a viewer selection of the TV tag, wherein the selection of the TV tag launches a display of an input area whereby users can indicate selection of at least one of the plurality of associated actions; and  
performing the at least one selected associated actions.

**[0011]** Claim 26 recites in part, “wherein a TV tag is implemented to modify the web-based content after the creation of the web-based content.” The Office cites both Schein and Nsonwu, as teaching a TV tag. (Office Action, pages 5 and 6.) Neither Schein nor Nsonwu teaches that the “wherein a TV tag is implemented to modify the web-based content after the creation of the web-based content” as is presently claimed by independent claim 45. Additionally, neither Schein nor Nsonwu teach or suggest wherein the TV tag comprises a selectable hyperlink.

**[0012]** Consequently, the combination of Schein and Nsonwu does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

*Dependent Claims 27-32*

**[0013]** Claims 27-32 ultimately depend from independent claim 26. As discussed above, claim 26 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 27-32 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

*Independent claim 33 and dependent claims 34-36*

**[0014]** Applicant respectfully contends that the arguments set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, as amended, applies with equal weight here and the cited art does not teach or suggest all of the claimed elements and features of independent claim 33. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of this claim. Further, dependent claims 34-36 are allowable for

at least the same reasons that independent claim 33 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 34-36.

*Independent claim 37 and dependent claims 38 and 40-44*

[0015] Applicant respectfully contends that the arguments set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, as amended, applies with equal weight here and the cited art does not teach or suggest all of the claimed elements and features of independent claim 37. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of this claim. Further, dependent claims 38 and 40-44 are allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 37 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 38 and 40-44.

*Independent claim 51 and dependent claims 52-55*

[0016] Applicant respectfully contends that the arguments set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, as amended, applies with equal weight here and the cited art does not teach or suggest all of the claimed elements and features of independent claim 51. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of this claim. Further, dependent claims 52-55 are allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 51 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 52-55.

### **Claims 45-48 and 50 Are Non-Obvious Over Schein, Nsonwu and Ellis**

[0017] Claims 45-48 and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Schein, Nsonwu and Ellis. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

#### **Independent Claim 45**

[0018] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that independent claim 45 as amended is obvious in view of the combination of Schein, Nsonwu and Ellis. Applicant submits that the combination of Schein, Nsonwu and Ellis does not teach or suggest the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

45. (Currently Amended) A method comprising:

rendering web-based biographies and news articles within a web browser application associated with a particular person, **wherein a selectable TV tag is embedded in the web-based biographies and news articles as the web-based biographies and news articles are created;**

rendering, along with the content, the selectable TV tag that is associated with the particular person, wherein the TV tag comprises;

a selectable hyperlink;

a plurality of associated actions; and

an associated data element;

receiving an indication of a viewer selection of the TV tag, wherein the selection of the TV tag launches a display of an input area whereby users can indicate selection of at least one of the plurality of associated actions; and

transmitting personalization data based on the selected TV tag to a TV planner system that generates a personalized version of a television broadcast schedule.

**[0019]** Claim 45 recites in part, “a selectable TV tag is embedded in the web-based biographies and news articles as the web-based biographies and news articles are created.” The Office cites Schein, Nsonwu and Ellis, as teaching a TV tag. (Office Action, page 20.) Neither Schein nor Nsonwu teaches that the “TV tag is embedded in the web-based content as the web-based content is created” as is presently claimed by independent claim 1. Additionally, neither Schein nor Nsonwu teach or suggest wherein the TV tag comprises a selectable hyperlink.

**[0020]** Consequently, the combination of Schein, Nsonwu and Ellis does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

**Dependent Claims 46-50**

**[0021]** Claims 46-50 ultimately depend from independent claim 45. As discussed above, claim 45 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 46-50 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.



## **Conclusion**

**[0022]** Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representative for Applicant

/Jason F. Lindh Reg. No. 59,090/ Dated: 2009-08-06  
Jason F. Lindh (jason@leehayes.com; 509-944-4715)  
Registration No. 59090